

United States Patent and Trademark Office
- Sales Receipt -

02/02/2006 TDAWKINS 00000002 210765 10054539

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA



Af

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

I hereby certify that this document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date set forth below.

Renee D. East
by Renee D. East
Date of signature and deposit - January 25, 2006

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Benjamin J. Parker et al) Group Art Unit: 2153
)
Serial No.: 10/054,539) Confirmation No.: 5974
)
Filed: 10/25/2001) Examiner: Aaron N. Strange
)
For: Service-Based Network Packet Routing) Attorney Docket: 1687(15722)
Redirection Using An Address Server)
)

APPELLANT'S AMENDED BRIEF ON APPEAL

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an appeal from the final rejection of the Examiner mailed June 20, 2005, rejecting claims 1-15, all of the claims in the case. This Amended Brief on Appeal is submitted to correct the deficiencies noted in the Notice mailed January 13, 2006.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in the present appeal is Sprint Communications Company L.P., assignee of the entire right, title, and interest in the present application.

unwarranted. Clearly, nothing from the proposed hypothetical situation leads to evidence of motivation to combine the references. From a network perspective, set-up will always require configuration of numerical addresses at some point, and no network technician or other administrative personnel could expect to completely avoid exposure to numerical addresses. It is doubtful that any meaningful improvement in performing administrative functions would be realized by some person who does not set up the address servers as suggested in the rejection. Furthermore, any small advantage to a technician in one limited situation would not justify the added network overhead and additional hardware that would have been required to achieve it. Thus, there is no motivation to combine RAD with Zheng et al and claims 1-3, 8, 10, and 11 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

The final rejection has failed to establish a case of *prima facie* obviousness of any of claims 1-15. The prior art relied upon in the final rejection neither teaches nor suggests the structure or function of the present invention nor does it provide any teaching which can obtain the significant advantages which are achieved by the present invention. Accordingly, the final rejection should be reversed.

An oral hearing is not requested. Please charge any fees to Sprint Communications Company L.P. deposit account 21-0765. A copy of this sheet is enclosed for accounting purposes.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Mollon
Registration No. 31,123
Attorney for Appellant

Date: January 25, 2006
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
Tel: 734-542-0228